

New gTLDs WG 30-01-2012 - Summary minutes

Summary Minutes - New gTLDs WG
30 January 2012

1. Review of the Agenda

2. Roll Call

3. Finalize Draft Objection Procedure

AD: Schedule for the Objection Procedures - ALAC would like to be able to approve the procedures in their f2f meeting in CR and have it set out in the Chair's Report. That means that the ALAC would likely need it in their hands by Sunday, 11 March. The rest of us needs one or two weeks to include the RALO comments and discuss them and make any changes that were prompted by the comments. So 26 Feb is latest for close of comments.

DAT: Re the RALO comments, one potential complication is that we will likely need to get the Flowcharts translated.

AD: Did not take that into consideration. Need to find out how long it will take to translate.

HU: Will ask CMR.

DAT: Does the Board need to approve of this document?

AG: The Board does not need to approve the ALAC procedures. It is the ALAC. Clearly, the Board could come back and say to continue working on them.

TBJ: Re the time-line, I think there is no problem.

AD: That presumes, we do a 21 day review. This seems reasonable and within the rules. If we can close on this today, that allows for the week for translation. Feb. 6 is the soonest we could send to the RALOs.

CLO: This also means that Silvia could suggest to add it to today's APRALO call.

AD: So the schedule seems to be ok. Will add the notion of translation. The document can be sent to Language Services today. A three week review is adequate.

AD: I don't want to get into wordsmithing at this point.

EL: Is anyone on this call aware of an organization that is planning on using our process?

AD: I know of one group who is possibly going to put in an objection. However, they wouldn't use the At-Large process. I raised the issue during the last ALAC call re who might use the At-Large process.

EL: I'm not sure if this question is that important. Does the source of that objection really need to be that defined?

AD: I think that is an ALAC question. This question came up from Dev's earliest work on this. I do think this is a decision you need to put a fork in somewhere. Perhaps this is something that can be discussed by AD, EL and DAT.

DAT: Reviewed changes in the Objection Process. Separate wiki pages need to be created. One for the process, one for the grounds. That is why you see the decision tree.

AM: One of the confusions is whether anyone or an ALS start a thread?

DAT: It is the gTLD RG that does this. If you don't have a wiki log on, you may contact the gTLD RG. They can then add the info.

RVS: Not available for public comment?

DAT: Wiki page could be accessed for comments only they have a login. Would need an email address for the gTLD RG.

EL: Will there be designated custodian?

DAT: The idea is that the first column would have the whole string of applications.

AD: Can this be built?

EL: One is of mechanics, one is...are we taking into account whether people will be applying for more than one string?

DAT: At the beginning of the application process, all...will be revealed. They will probably...so will be be two columns.

DAT: It is not within chronological order....The gTLD RG would review the wiki page.

AG: If an objection is to be filed, certainly it has to be ALAC that has to file it. However, re a comment, it is not clear who needs to be consulted. Also, if comments are posted, and no one in this group agrees, it will be challenging.

AD: I'm not sure why he thinks it would need to come back to this group. They are the one reviewingThe other part is that there is always a notion that at the end of the process it goes to ALAC. However, it is the this group that would make a fully formed submission of why an objection needs to be filed. It seems to me that if the RG has the focus, that they are sending it to ALAC not the new gTLD WG.

DAT: Correct. That is going one step further than the flowchart. My suggestion is that the 8 weeks...

AG: I raise the issue of the RG...for a comment to be filed, does it need to come from the ALAC? We don't want a perception that ALAC supports it when it hasn't gone through them.

DAT: If you go through the rest of the flowchart (week 8), all the formal comments would be finalized. If ALAC approves it, then they will formally submit it to the PC forum.

AG: Dev, are you assuming that that the RG will have some criteria?

DAT: To answer Rudi's question in the chat, yes, an ALS can submit a comment. It is the objection that has more stringent requirements.

AD: Anyone can make a comment.

DAT: The ultimate question is whether ALAC would want to have the final word on

AG: I agree partially with Avri. I can imagine a situation in which one or two RALOs raise an issue, can't be a rubber stamp, that the ALAC can make an objection. I don't think it needs to come from three RALOs. I can imagine a situation where one RALO will feel very strongly.

DAT: There is the question of how much it costs to make an objection.

AD: I don't think that there needs to be a threshold of three agreeing. Perhaps, one agreeing and two concurring.

DAT: Re how is the final decision made?

AD: I suggest we continue to discuss this.

AG: Do we really believe that we will be receiving a lot of comments.

AD: I'd be surprised if we ended up with zero, but I'd also be surprised if we received more than 3 or 4.

AD: We need an overview page - that says what is on each of the page. This can be sent either with the chart or after to translation. Final cut off is next Monday's meeting for the chart.

4. Update on the ASP

AD: SARP members will be announced in the next couple of days.

In terms of further work, we received a mushy review. I don't think that is good enough. We also have not heard what they are planning for outreach for applicants who are getting support.

AM: Is there outreach?

AD: There is indication. However, I haven't seen an outreach program.

5. Update on gTLD Issues

Matt has created a wiki page. However, it is still being developed.

AD: Please speak with Cintra on this wiki page.

Pending Action Items Not Yet covered

AD reviewed action items.

6. AOB

None.

Meeting adjourned.